

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 22 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1-15, 23 and 24 have been allowed. Claim 16 is rejected. Claims 17-22 are objected to. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 2, claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi et al (USPN 5,678,488; hereafter, Yamaguchi et al.). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 16 has been amended.

It is respectfully submitted that Yamaguchi et al. does not teach or suggest a paper guidance system for an image forming apparatus, comprising: a feeding roller for the image forming apparatus, to feed a paper to an image forming system; and a plurality of guide members forming a paper transferring path, wherein the plurality of guide members comprises a first guide member disposed near to the feeding roller, the first guide member including a notch that aligns a leading edge of the paper so that the leading edge of the paper is aligned parallel with a rotation axis of the feeding roller, as is recited by amended claim 16.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 16 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Yamaguchi et al (USPN 5,678,488). Since claims 17-22 depend from amended claim 16, directly or indirectly, claims 17-22 are submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Yamaguchi et al (USPN 5,678,488) for at least the reasons that amended claim 16 is submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Yamaguchi et al (USPN 5,678,488).

ALLOWED CLAIMS:

A. Claims 1-15, 23 and 24 were allowed.

B. Claims 17-22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 16 has been amended. Claims 17-22 have been amended to depend from, or already depend from, directly or indirectly, amended claim 16. Since amended claim 16 is submitted to be in allowable form, claims 17-22 are submitted to be allowable for at least the reasons that amended claim 16 is submitted to be allowable.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 2, 2004

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501